$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\# **CNR No. DLHC010514752026**

\+ CRL.M.C. 8045/2026, CRL.M.A. 33592/2026 & CRL.M.A. 33593/2026

JATINDER PAL SINGH .....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate.

versus

CONTICAB CABLES INDIA (PVT.) LTD.
& ANR. .....Respondents
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

O R D E R

% 28.10.2026

CRL.M.A. 33593/2026 *(exemption)*

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 8045/2026

2. This petition has been filed seeking to quash the criminal complaints filed against the petitioner under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 ('NI Act'), which are stated to be pending before the Court of ACJM, Shahdara District, KKD Courts, Delhi.

3. The present proceedings arise out of complaints filed by the respondent no.1/complainant under Sections 138/141 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, against Cap Cab India Ltd. (accused no.1) and its directors, including the petitioner/Jatinder Pal Singh (accused no.2).

4. It is stated that the signing authority of the cheques in question was

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/11/2026 at 11:04:11

accused no.3, namely Inder Pal Singh, who was stated to be exclusively handling the financial, operational and commercial affairs of the company. It is further stated that the accused no.3 expired on 29th July 2025 and the proceedings *qua* him stand abated.

5. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who is the accused no.2 in the aforesaid complaints, was not involved in the running of the Company and has been falsely named in the complaint.

6. I have heard counsel for the petitioner and perused the complaint.

7. The relevant extracts from the aforesaid complaint are set out below:

> *"3. That* ***the accused No. 2 and 3, used to deal with the complainant and are in charge of and responsible for the day to day running of the business of the accused No.1. That both the accused No. 2 and 3 have been dealing with the complainant since long and the business association ever since year 2011 has been cordial and fruitful. That to the best of knowledge of the complainant, nothing transacts in the accused no.1 company without the knowledge of the accused No. 2 & 3, its directors.*** *That the accused have been making payments on regular basis and thus they have gained the confidence of the complainant. That gradually the complainant started supplying items without insisting on advance realization of payment and the complainant has raised various Invoices in this connection in the name of the accused no.1 towards the said purchases.*
>
> *4. That during December 2014, in partial discharge of the balance liability as per the ledger account of the complainant, the accused no. 2 & 3 have issued the cheque bearing no. 684635 dated 15.12.2014 for Rs. 10,00,000.00 drawn on OD Account No. 0180261007858 of Canara Bank, Janpath, New Delhi-110001 and assured the complainant that the cheque shall be cleared on presentation. That the original cheque bearing no. 684635 dated 15.12.2014 for Rs. 10,00,000.00 drawn on OD Account No. 0180261007858 of Canara Bank, Janpath, New Delhi-110001 is produced herein as ANNEXURE CW1/B."*

8. A perusal of the aforesaid averments shows that specific allegations

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/11/2026 at 11:04:11

have been made against the petitioner. The complaint does not merely describe the petitioner as a director of accused no.1 company, but specifically states that accused no.2 and 3 were dealing with the complainant and were in charge of and responsible for the day-to-day running of the business of accused no.1. It is further specifically alleged that accused no.2 and 3 had been dealing with the complainant since 2011 and that the cheque in question was issued by accused no.2 and 3 towards discharge of the liability of accused no.1.

9. The fact that accused no.3, who is stated to be the signatory of the cheques, has expired, by itself, does not furnish any ground for quashing the proceedings against the petitioner, particularly when the complaint contains specific averments against the petitioner regarding his role in the affairs of the company and the transaction in question.

10. In view of the specific averments made against the petitioner, who is accused no.2 in the complaint, no ground for quashing of the complaint is made out.

11. The various contentions raised by the petitioner with respect to his alleged non-involvement in the affairs of the company and the fact that the cheques were not signed by him are in the nature of defence taken by the petitioner, which can only be proved during trial.

12. Accordingly, there is no merit in the present petition.

13. The present petition is dismissed.

AMIT BANSAL, J

OCTOBER 28, 2026
at

This is a digitally signed order.
The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.
The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 02/11/2026 at 11:04:11